Analysis of a sample of Turk-A-Tox showed that it consisted essentially of carbolic acid, gluconic acid, glycerine, and water. The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on the label: "Prophylactic For Turkeys * * * An aid in the control of Blackhead in turkeys," were false and mis-

leading since the article would not be effective for such purposes.

Analysis of a sample of Mineral Block showed that the product consisted essentially of compounds of calcium, and smaller proportions of compounds of sodium, iron, phosphorus, carbonates, chlorides, and sulfates, and contained not more than 26.1 percent of calcium oxide, equivalent to 18.6 percent of calcium and not more than 0.6 percent of phosphorus. Based on this analysis the following statements on the label were alleged to be false and misleading: "Calcium Oxide * * * 30%, Calcium * * * not more than 25%, Phosphorus, * * * not less than 4%, * * * Potassium Iodide, .05%." It was alleged to be further misbranded in that the therapeutic claims made for the article were false and misleading since the article was not effective for such purposes. The representations and suggestions were in part as follows: That the article would improve the appetite and finish of livestock, would increase production of livestock, and the health of livestock; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of various breeding diseases, would stimulate the secretion of the thyroid glands and have a beneficial effect upon the nervous system of the animal, and would have value to the blood.

Analysis of a sample of Murco Antiseptic Tablets showed that the tablets contained calcium, sodium and zinc phenolsulfonates, citric acid, bichloride of mercury 4.2 grains per tablet, and talc. It was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that statements in the carton and in the label represented and suggested that the article would act as internal antiseptic, prevent or control disease, guard against and reduce the chances of spreading disease, keep the flock healthy, prevent bowel disorders such as indigestion, constipation, pasting up of the vent, and similar troubles; that it would prevent the spread of colds and bronchitis and roupy conditions; that it would be efficacious and beneficial in healing the intestines of the birds after the flock had been wormed; and that the articles would be efficacious in cases of coccidiosis, fowl typhoid, cholera, and worming, were false and misleading since the article would not be efficacious for such purposes. (2) In that its label failed to bear accurate statements of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight and measure. (3) In that its label did not bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of bichloride of

mercury which it contained.

Examination of a sample of Mineralized Molactas Block-Hog Brick with Nicotinic Acid, showed that the product consisted essentially of mineral salts, carbohydrates, nitrogenous matter, charcoal, and moisture, and contained not more than 39 percent of nitrogen-free extract, not more than 0.8 percent of phosphorus, not less than 9 percent of calcium, and not less than 7 percent of salt. Based on this examination the following statements, borne on the carton were alleged to be false and misleading: "Analysis: * * Nitrogen carton, were alleged to be false and misleading: "Analysis: * * * * Calcium Free Extract, not less than 63.0%. Potassium Iodide, * * * * * 4.2%, Phosphorus * * * 1.4%, Iodine * * * .04%, Salt not more than 2.5%." It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statements appearing on the circular accompanying the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious for keeping all livestock healthy; for wormy hogs; for preventing or controling intestinal parasites of hogs; as a preventive of bloating of livestock; in the control of intestinal worms, and as a source of elements that are healing and soothing to the bruised intestines, whereas the article would not be effective for such purposes.

The Mineralized Molactas Block, Mineral Block, and Mineralized Molactas Block with Nicotinic Acid were also misbranded as reported in notices of

judgment on foods.

On September 11, 1942, a plea of guilty having been entered to all counts on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$25 on each count; the fines on the counts charging violation of the drug sections of the act amounting to \$125.

899. Misbranding of Pup-Up Tablets. U. S. v. 2¾ Gross Packages of Pup-Up Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4836. Sample No. 47981–E.)

On June 4, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against the above-named product at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 28, 1941, by Arner Co. from Buffalo, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of sodium phenobarbital, ephedrine hydrochloride, ephedrine sulfate, starch, and milk sugar.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was an effective and appropriate treatment and prophylactic for distemper in dogs were false and misleading since it would not be an effective and appropriate treatment for such condition.

On July 17, 1942, the claimant having withdrawn its claim and answer, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

900. Misbranding of poultry remedies. U. S. v. 19 Packages of Pratt's Poultry Regulator and 12 Bottles of Pratt's Poultry Inhalant. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered destroyed. (F. D. C. No. 7413. Sample Nos. 54862–E, 54863–E.)

On April 29, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel at Trenton, N. J., against 19 packages, each containing 23/4 pounds, of Pratt's Poultry Regulator, and 8 pint bottles and 4 quart bottles of Pratt's Poultry Inhalant, alleging that they were shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 27, 1942, by Pratt Food Co., from Philadelphia, Pa.

Examination of a sample of Pratt's Poultry Regulator showed that it consisted essentially of peanut hull meal, iron oxide, calcium carbonate, bone meal, and Epsom salt, together with small amounts of gentian root, fenugreek and nux

vomica, and iodides.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was effective as a regulator, tonic, and appetizer for increasing egg production, was effective for preventing food deficiency diseases, and was effective for building greater vigor and disease resistance in poultry, whereas the article was not so effective.

Examination of a sample of Pratt's Poultry Inhalant showed that it consisted essentially of water, ethyl alcohol, methyl alcohol, formaldehyde, boric acid, and

oil of eucalyptus.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that it was effective in the relief, treatment, and prevention of diseases, symptoms, and conditions affecting the respiratory tract of poultry, whereas it was not so effective.

On December 8, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation

was entered and the article was ordered destroyed.

INDEX TO NOTICES OF JUDGMENT D. N. J. NOS. 851-900

PRODUCTS

N.J.No. A and D vitamin concentrate tablets

¹ Injunction issued. Contains findings of fact and conclusions of law.